PRIVILEGE MOTION

Re : A Member's remarks about the Composition of the Select Committee on Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill, 1957.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received another motion of privilege, tabled by Hon'ble Sri V. P. Deenadayalu Naidu. He has given notice of his intention to raise a question of privilege in the House.

It appears when the Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill was being discussed in the House, Shri Muckannappa remarked that considering the names of members of the Select Committee, no purpose would be served by referring the Bill to the Select Committee. He has also stated that above one-third of the members constituting the committee have got vested interests inasmuch as they are either related to the bus owners or connected with the bus owners in some way or other. Another remark made by Shri Muckannappa is against two members in particular who according to him are interested parties and will naturally try to safeguard their interests as such no justice could be expected from them. The exact words uttered by him are; "ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 5ನೆಯ ನಂಬರಿನ ಮತ್ತು 14ನೆಯ ನಂಬರಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾಂಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್ ಇದೆ. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಬಂಧುಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಂಪನಿಯವರನ್ನೂ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ಮನಸ್ಸುಳ್ಳವರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ." Shri Deenadayalu Naidu has taken objection to these words on the ground that they were casting reflection on another member of the House and thus it constituted a breach of privilege of the member.

The point to be considered is whether the words uttered by Sri Muckannappa are really reflections on another member. It has been ruled that reflections on another member should not be too general in character. They must relate to a particular conduct of the member in relation to his Parliamentary duties.

What Sri Muckannappa has said would appear to come under his criticism against the motion before the House. It is open to a member to oppose a motion or to move an amendment thereto. He will have to give his reasons for this. Sri Muckannappa has given his reasons for not referring the Bill to a Select Committee on the ground that some of the members happened to be interested parties. It does not therefore amount to reflection on another member. It is only criticism offered by a member,

Therefore, there is no *prima facie* case of breach of privilege in this.

MYSORE SALES TAX BILL, 1957.

Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee on the Mysore Sales Tax Bill, 1957. While presenting the report I beg to inform the House of the unstinted co-operation extended by the Members of the Select Committee in formulating the Report. Sir, the Members of the Select Committee had a very strenuous time. We had almost morning and evening sittings. We worked late in the nights. Therefore, I must pay my humble tribute to all the Members, who, regardless of the inconveniences, worked to finalise the Report of the Select Committee. As has been pointed out in the Report itself, we have tried to simplify the measure and to rationalise the provisions. The Bill presented to the House in the original form was not very clear in the items brought under the Schedules.

Now, we have to rationalise the items under various schedules. We have therefore rearranged the items under the respective schedules so that the whole thing may be clear to every one. To cite an instance, we have taken out all the items on which additional levy is proposed to be levied under Schedule I. Then all articles where taxation is proposed to be levied are put in one schedule; then all articles proposed to be taxed at the purchase point are put under another schedule;